

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : **PATEL**, Rakesh Thakor et al. Confirmation No. 2711
Appl. No : 10/816,841
Filed : April 5, 2004
Title : PACKET BASED TRANSMISSION OF MULTIPLE DATA SIGNALS
T.C./A.U. : 2419
Examiner : ZHU, Bo Hui Alvin
Docket No. : 12351-12
Customer No. : 1059

April 29, 2010

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450

**RE: Statement Establishing Unintentional Delay
In Support of Petition for Revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

This letter is responsive to the final office action dated June 24, 2009 (the “Office Action”) and the advisory actions dated September 23, 2009 (the “First Office Action”) and February 2, 2010 (the “Second Office Action”) and the Notice of Abandonment dated February 18, 2010.

The Applicant filed an initial response to the Office Action on August 20, 2009 in response to the Office Action. The Examiner maintained his position in the First Advisory Action, rejecting some of the claims, allowing claims 14 and 16-20 and indicating that claims 5, 6 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.



The Applicant then filed an amendment on December 23, 2009, with the appropriate extension fees, amending the independent claims to incorporate in substance the limitations of claim 5. A minor semantic change was presented, although, in the view of the undersigned, this amendment did not change the scope of the allowed subject matter. In the Applicant's view, the claims were amended into allowable condition consistent with the Examiners identification of allowed and allowable claims in the Office Action. The Applicant fully expected that the case would be allowed in response to the amendment.

The Examiner determined that the amendments changed the scope of the claims such that further consideration and search is required. The amendment was not entered and the case is presently abandoned.

During the entire period since December 23, 2009, the Applicant has intended to prosecute this application to issuance and maintains that intention.

The Applicant now petitions the Commissioner to reinstate this application. Together with the petition for reinstatement, the applicant has filed an amendment to bring the claims into condition for allowance and a request for continued examination.

Conclusion

The Applicant requests that the Commissioner reinstate this case and allow the Examiner to review the amendment filed contemporaneously with this submission.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone or e-mail to address any issues that can expedite this case.

Respectfully submitted,
PATEL et al.

By



Bhupinder Randhawa
Reg. No. 47,276
brandhawa@bereskinparr.com
(416) 957-1630